



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Gleoir do Dhia a n-ána hárduib, agus píodcán an dtalamh deagóil do na dáoimh.

LUKE ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

VOL. IV.—NO. 47.

NOVEMBER 17, 1855.

{ Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance.

CONTENTS.

| | Page. |
|--|-------|
| The Blessed Cornelius; or, Some Tidings of an Archbishop of Armagh in the 12th Century | 121 |
| Religious Processions—Jubilee of Our Lady of Hanswyck | 123 |
| Faber on the Blessed Sacrament—1855 | 124 |
| The Ancient Mansion—A Parable | 126 |
| Talk of the Road—No. XXXIII. | 126 |
| Bones versus Bibles—The Most Rev. Dr. Dixon and the Redemptorist Fathers | 127 |
| Reasons for not Reading the Bible—by St. Patrick | 128 |

CORRESPONDENCE:

| | |
|--|-----|
| On Certain Relics in Oviedo in Spain | 129 |
| On Bible Burning—by "In Earnest" | 130 |
| On Religious Controversy—by a Munster-Man | 131 |
| On the Effect of Prayer—by Pat Murray of Westmeath | 131 |
| On Holy Wells—by Humphrey Leary | 131 |
| Farming Operations for November | 131 |

THE BLESSED CORNELIUS.

Archbishops write books only on great occasions.

We have now before us a book, just published, called "THE BLESSED CORNELIUS;" or Some Tidings of an Archbishop of Armagh who went to Rome in the 12th century and did not return; the title page of which tells us (in bold defiance of the statute in that case made and provided), that it was written by the most Rev. Joseph Dixon, Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland.* It is a learned work on the thigh-bone of one of his predecessors.

In the *Catholic Layman* for October, 1854 (p. 117), we called on Dr. Dixon, or any one else who believes him the successor of the ancient Archbishops of Ireland, to give the list of his succession, which we undertook to publish. In October, 1855 (p. 112), we pointed to the fact that, during a whole year, no one had attempted to produce such a list. We now find that Dr. Dixon has been looking for his predecessors during that year; and here is the result. Instead of a succession, which he has not to show, he makes a flourish with a thigh-bone, which he has certainly got, but which, we think, is not the thigh bone of the man whom he supposes to have been the owner.

We take the account of this important discovery from Dr. Dixon's book. In chapter xi., p. 68, he tells us "how I came to hear of the blessed Cornelius." All he had ever heard of him before is comprised in this sentence from the "Annals of the Four Masters," one of the highest authorities in Irish history. Under the date 1175, they say—"Connor (Cornelius) Mac Concoilleadh, Abbot of St. Peter and St. Paul's, and afterwards Coarb of St. Patrick (Archbishop of Armagh), died at Rome, whither he had gone to confer with the successor of St. Peter."† All the best Irish authorities agree in this account—viz.: Lanigan, Ecclesiastical History, vol. iv. p. 220 and 229;‡ Colgan, Trias Thaumaturga, who calls him Conchovar; Ware on Irish Bishops, who calls him Concoabar. All these authorities give the same account as the Four Masters; and, beyond this, nothing was known of Cornelius by Dr. Dixon or any one else.§ However, when Dr. Dixon was at Rome, in December, 1854, where he had gone to help in making the new article of faith, he happened to see, in a newspaper, a statement that "St. Concord," whose bones are kept in a glass case, on the altar of the Church of Lemenc, at Chambery, in Savoy, was the identical Cornelius of Armagh, who had been so long missing.

In December, 1854, Dr. Dixon received from the bishop of St. Maurienne, in Savoy, an account of this Cornelius, or Concord, asking for more information about his life in Ireland, and offering to give a piece of his remains to Dr. Dixon. In consequence of this document (which we shall give farther on), Dr. Dixon resolved to go home by Chambery, and get his prize to bring to Armagh.

Dr. Dixon thus describes (p. 68) the state in which he

found the saint:—"For a long time his holy reliquies had reposed in a poor walnut shrine, and were covered with still poorer ornaments, when, on the occasion of repairing the church, the happy idea was adopted of replacing this precious treasure in more suitable state. The wretched panel which formed the front of the shrine was replaced with a handsome plate glass; and, thanks to the zeal of several pious persons, the holy bishop is richly adorned. On Saturday, July 1st, 1854, he was replaced upon his altar."

A pamphlet written by Count Firnex on that occasion, and inserted in Dr. Dixon's book (p. 78), gives this account of what was done:—"Some months had elapsed since the reliquies were brought from Rome, where they have been recognized and authenticated by the venerable prelate who is charged to perform this duty. For this purpose documents had been forwarded to the Eternal City, relative to the life of this Saint and the veneration in which he is held by all in this country, in virtue of the authorization of the Holy See; and they were found so interesting that, to enter on a closer examination, they have gone so far as to open the head of this revered body. God has, doubtless, permitted this minute investigation in order to manifest more clearly the glory of his servant, for, in the interior portion of this sacred part of the reliquies, which have been for nearly seven centuries entombed (on the altar?) the brain was found hard and still coloured with blood, though it is well known that this organ is of a soft nature, and is consumed in ordinary bodies in a very short space of time. Struck by this discovery, the Roman Examiner before whom the operation had been made, availing himself of his right to some portion of the holy reliquies, wished to retain this part, but the Rev. Father Alphonse, Capuchin, charged with the commission, having insisted on his making choice of some other portion, the interesting part was returned to increase the treasure of Lemenc, where it is enshrined apart in a silver reliquary." (p. 78).*

Count Firnex proceeds (p. 80) to describe the dress:—"The saint's body is apparelled in mitre and chasuble, the latter cut in an antique form, and its texture is like that of the other accessories, of white silk, embroidered with gold. The albs appears to be beautifully worked; and the cushion that supports the head is of red damask, trimmed with gold fringe. The pallium is spread out near the mitre. In a word, all connected with the apparel shows a perfect coincidence with the most approved taste."

We feel satisfied that no Paris milliner could have done it better. Dr. Dixon evidently found the saint "in full fig." certainly he had been grossly neglected before, but it was well-arranged that the saint should be "new done up" for the important part he is henceforward to act, and that just in the nick of time to receive Dr. Dixon.

Dr. Dixon then relates his arrival and his reception at Chambery, and how "the devout throng had assembled to see the successor of the Blessed Concord, at a distance of 700 years from his time, saying mass at his altar." (p. 74). Dr. Dixon then went to the monastery where St. Concord died. "From this house we went to visit the convent of the Carmelite nuns: this community, too, had a special interest for us. To these good nuns had been committed the office of dressing (and of undressing, as it seems) the blessed Concord in the new Pontifical ornaments which he now wore. They had also been good enough to prepare, in a beautiful case, a small relic of the holy man, intended as a present for the church of Armagh. But now they were about to establish the strongest claim of all on our gratitude, by taking the trouble—and it was no slight trouble—to undress the saint, and procure for us the bone of the thigh, that we might thus have a considerable relic to bring to Armagh. All this was to be done privately, that the people of the parish might not be generally aware of what had happened; for, great as was their respect for the successor of the blessed Concord (that's himself), they would hardly have endured to see so much of the bones of their revered patron and protector carried

away from them. May God reward those good daughters of St. Teresa for their trouble. One good nun rose from her sick bed, where she had been confined for a month, to take a share in it" (p. 74, 75).

This narrative calls for some observations from us. 1. We think Dr. Dixon plumes himself too much on so petty larceny. If Dr. Dixon were worth anything—and if the "blessed Cornelius" were worth anything, too—the doctor should have had him body and bones. 2. We think Dr. Dixon exaggerates the risk of the larceny. We cannot suppose that Dr. Dixon, having got his own bones safe in a distant country, would expose these poor nuns to the fury of a deceived and injured populace; it would be a base return for kindness—but since Dr. Dixon has not scrupled to expose them in a book, which will, of course, be popular at Chambery, we trust that the danger is imaginary.

What Dr. Dixon did carry off is safely lodged—"the portion of the rib at the presentation convent in Drogheha, and the bone of the thigh at the convent of the SACRED HEART, Armagh" (p. 104). It might have been more suitable to have placed the rib at the heart; but this, of course, is only temporary. Before long there will be a grand religious display, on occasion of placing the bones on the altar of God.

The object of bringing home these bones is thus pointed at: "I have applied to the Sacred Congregation of Rites in Rome for permission to have his office celebrated in the diocese of Armagh, under the same rite as at Chambery" (p. 104). That permission will, of course, be granted: the bones of Cornelius are to be an object of "veneration," and Cornelius himself is to be "worshipped."

Roman Catholics sometimes try to justify the worship of Saints by saying, "we do not pray to them; we only ask them to pray for us." This idle distinction is not to be observed in the worship of Cornelius. Dr. Dixon gives in his book a "PRAYER TO ST. CONCORD," which runs thus, "Oh, glorious St. Concord, . . . I come profoundly humbled, to prostrate myself at thy feet, to obtain, through thy powerful protection (not intercession) a grace very necessary for the salvation of my soul [here the particular favour which one seeks is specified]. Draw me from this urgent peril, and give me the courage and strength necessary to overcome the attack of the enemy who seeks my destruction and eternal damnation, &c" (p. 104). Here St. Concord is asked himself to give and to do the things prayed for. There is not a word in the prayer, asking him to pray to God for the things required. So the Irish Roman Catholics are to be taught to pray to St. Concord, that He will save them from the devil and damnation.

At the end of the introduction (p. xii), Dr. Dixon acknowledges that Cornelius has not been canonized by the Pope. Yet, in page 104, Dr. Dixon teaches men to offer actual prayer to Cornelius. We have hitherto thought that Roman Catholics were allowed to pray only to Saints who have been canonized by the Pope. Such a precaution would seem only reasonable; for, surely, if men want infallible direction in anything, they should have it concerning the object of prayer. But, it seems we were wrong: Roman Catholics are taught by Dr. Dixon to pray not only to canonized Saints, but to dead men who have not been canonized. It, therefore, becomes a question of the highest interest—what degree of proof or certainty Roman Catholics have that the objects of their worship, and the beings they pray to, are really right ones. We have, therefore, to examine the documents on which Dr. Dixon relies for his facts about Cornelius, which facts, be it observed, are these—1. That Concord of Chambery and Cornelius of Armagh are the same person. 2. That miracles have been worked by his bones since the time of his death.

THE DOCUMENTS.

Dr. Dixon produces—

1. An extract from a newspaper (p. 68).
2. A communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne in Savoy, written in December, 1854 (p. 69).
3. A pamphlet called, "A Tribute to the blessed Cornelius," written in July, 1854, by Count Firnex, of which Dr. Dixon publishes part, but not the whole" (p. 77).
4. A life of St. Concord, printed in Chambery, in 1809. Dr. Dixon professes to give some facts from this life, but he does not publish the life itself (p. 95).

* Published by James Duffy, 7, Wellington-quay, Dublin, 1855.
† Ed. Connellean, Dublin, 1846, p. 10. ‡ Ed. Dublin, 1822.
§ Dr. Dixon himself says—"Here we have an Archbishop of Armagh, of whose life his country has preserved no details, and with the place of whose death it has been hitherto unacquainted."—Introduction, p. 10. Yet at p. 104, Dr. Dixon tells us that, 200 years ago, the people of Chambery wrote to Hugh O'Reilly, then Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, telling him all about it.

5. An extract from a letter of Ferrandus to Bollandus, in 1653, with a note by Papebroch (p. 116); with a hymn to St. Concord (p. 106); all taken from the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists.

Dr. Dixon tells us of other documents, which, he says, do exist, but which he does not publish in his book. 1. Dr. Dixon tells us (p. 101, 102, and note to 103) that a bull was issued by Pope Clement X. in the year 1671, establishing a confraternity of St. Concord, at Chambery. Dr. Dixon does not insert this bull in his book; for which we imagine he had an excellent reason.* 2. The pamphlet of Count Firnex, which Dr. Dixon publishes (p. 78), tells us, "Some months have elapsed since the relics were brought from Rome, where they have been recognised and authenticated by the venerable prelate who is charged to perform this duty. For this purpose, documents had been forwarded to the eternal city, relative to the life of this Saint." It would have been most interesting to have seen the documents on which the relics of St. Concord were officially pronounced authentic. But Dr. Dixon does not produce these documents. 3. Some document must have been issued by the venerable prelate, charged with the duty of authenticating the relics. But Dr. Dixon does not produce that document. 4. Dr. Dixon might have published the life of St. Concord, which he says was printed in 1809, and which he says he has got. But he does not publish it, but only tells us something out of it.

In the introduction, p. viii., Dr. Dixon says: "And whereas the details of the history of this Archbishop are but scanty, as far as I could discover, I was obliged to introduce some other subject in order to give anything like the dimensions of a book to this publication." That, under such circumstances, Dr. Dixon should not insert the bull of Pope Clement X. and the "documents relating to the life of this saint," and even the life itself at length, gives rise to grave suspicion. The omission can only be accounted for thus:—Either these documents do not really exist; or Dr. Dixon is conscious that they would not bear examination: in other words, the case is a fraudulent case, to be established only by the suppression of truth. We can well imagine the reason of the suppression of those documents. At p. 116 Dr. Dixon produces the conjecture of Ferrandus and Papebroch in 1653, that Concord of Chambery was an Irish archbishop or bishop. In p. 103 he states the people of Chambery, before the year 1656, wrote to Hugh O'Reilly, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, inquiring about the history of Concord as archbishop of Armagh. How very awkward, then, to produce a bull, dated 1671, showing that the Pope at that date did not treat Concord as an Irishman at all! If the Bull had called him an Irishman, it would certainly have been produced. To produce the documents on which he says it was officially determined that the bones at Chambery belong to Cornelius of Armagh would have been still more awkward, since no such documents exist. 3. To produce the decree of authentication itself would have been most natural, if such a decree really exists, which we greatly doubt. 4. Dr. Dixon lets out the reason why he does not publish the life of St. Concord, printed at Chambery in 1809. It contains "some things regarding the state of the Irish Church in the days of Cornelius which have been drawn from sources not the most reliable" (p. 95). It was evidently from this pamphlet that the Bishop of St. Maurienne took his statement, and it would never have done to have exposed its blunders. So Dr. Dixon was forced to leave out all these important documents, and fill up his book about "blessed Cornelius" with sad accounts of his own sea-sickness; and of his, Dr. Dixon's, "Introduction to the Scriptures," splendidly bound by Mr. James Duffy, which the Pope very naturally observed, "as it was written in English, could be but of little service to him" (p. 6). These evident suppressions make us examine more carefully the documents which Dr. Dixon produces. The only important ones are the communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne, and the extracts from the Bollandists. That sent by the Bishop of St. Maurienne is demonstrably inaccurate, for it makes Cornelius "one of the lights of the Councils of Cashel and Armagh, presided over by Cardinal Paparo;" whereas, Dr. Dixon himself has to confess (note, p. 96) that no trace of such council as this at Armagh can be found; and Cardinal Paparo, as every tyro in Irish history knows, had actually left Ireland twenty years before the synod of Cashel was held. Hence it appears that this document is not founded on authentic evidence, but is the production of some one grossly ignorant of Irish history.

This document betrays equal ignorance of the history of the popes—ignorance so palpable as to make it evident that forgery had been at work in the matter. We do not bring the charge of forgery against Dr. Dixon or the Bishop of St. Maurienne. Their statements are evidently taken from the "Life of St. Concord," printed at Chambery in 1809. But Dr. Dixon himself admits that this life contains things which have been drawn from sources not the most reliable (p. 95). And although labouring under a lack of material, he does not venture to publish that life. Yet he adopts statements from it which his knowledge of the history of the Papacy should

have at once pointed out to him as forged. We refer to the following passage:—"Immediately afterwards, he (Cornelius) went to Rome on important business. The Pope ALEXANDER III. being made acquainted with the merit and high sanctity of this prelate, loaded him with favours and distinctions" (p. 70).

Dr. Dixon gives the following account, as from the printed life, though not in the words of the life:—"Concord, seeing that after all his solicitude and labours in the cause of religion, there were still reforms to be made in the discipline of his Church, would not undertake these reforms without visiting Rome, and taking counsel with the Pope. He, therefore, set out for the Eternal City, where he arrived on the 16th January, 1176. We shall give the rest in the words of his biographer:—ALEXANDER III., fully instructed regarding the piety of this bishop, immediately granted his request," &c., (p. 98).

Now, we are able to prove that Cornelius did not see Pope Alexander III. at Rome; neither was it to see Pope Alexander III. that he went to Rome. For this good reason—that Pope Alexander III. was not there, and Cornelius must have known that he was not there. Pope Alexander III. had fled from Rome some years before; he was certainly not at Rome in the years 1175 or 1176; and did not get back to Rome until at least two years after Cornelius was dead. And this was notorious to all the world; and, least of all, could the Irish prelates be ignorant of it, who had heard but too much of Pope Alexander III. for the last three years, as we shall see.

That Cornelius should have gone to Rome in 1175 or 1176, to see Pope Alexander III., would have been about as absurd as if Dr. Dixon had gone to Rome in 1848 to see Pope Pius IX., when all the world knew that he had fled from it.

But do not "the Four Masters," and all the best Irish historians, say that Cornelius "went to Rome, to confer with the successor of St. Peter, in 1175?" They do say so; but they do not say that it was Pope ALEXANDER III. that he went to confer with. We must explain this puzzle for our readers. If they will look back to our number for September, p. 102, they will see that there were such things as "opposition Popes," and a good many of them, too.

Now, it happens that, while Cornelius was at Rome, there were two Popes at once, as there very often were—namely, Callistus III. and Alexander III.—and CALLISTUS III. was then in possession of ROME, where Alexander III. dared not show his face. We take the facts of this schism from the learned Roman Catholic historian, Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbonne.

Pope Adrian IV. died at Rome in 1159. Cardinal Roland was then chosen Pope at Rome, under the title of Pope Alexander III. At the same time, Octavian was also chosen Pope at Rome by others of the Cardinals, under the title of Victor III. The Emperor interfered to settle the dispute, and Alexander withdrew to Anagnia. A council of fifty archbishops and bishops met, and gave judgment in favour of Victor as lawful Pope. In the meantime, Alexander took refuge in Sicily, till he could get away to France. He arrived in France at Easter, 1162, and at Paris 1163. Octavian died in 1161, and Guy of Crema was elected in his place, under the title of Paschal III. Alexander was recalled to Rome in 1165. Great contests and wars then followed; sometimes Alexander had possession of Rome, and sometimes Paschal; but in 1170 Alexander retired to Anagnia, and then to Benevento. About 1170, Paschal III. died in possession of Rome, and his party chose for Pope, John, Abbot of Struma, under the title of Callistus III., and the Emperor acknowledged him as Pope. "Although Alexander's affairs prospered every day more and more, the Romans could not be induced to receive him into their city, and he usually resided either at Frescati or in Campania." The Emperor, being unsuccessful in war, was obliged to come to terms with Alexander III. They met at Venice in 1177, and the Emperor agreed to abandon Pope Callistus III., and to acknowledge Alexander as Pope, and to restore him to the "Regalia of St. Peter." In the following year, 1178, he was recalled to Rome by the clergy, senate, and people of that city (*Ecclesiastical Writers*, vol. ii., p. 332 ed., Dublin, 1724).

Every fact or document that we can collect confirms the proof that Pope Alexander III. was not in Rome in 1175 or 1176 (the only years in which Cornelius could have been there), but that he was residing and performing all his official acts elsewhere. In December, 1174, at Ferentium, he granted a charter to the monastery of Palermo (Baronius, *annals* xii. 634). In February, 1175, at Anagnia, another charter to the same. (Idem). In March, 1175, to another monastery, at Ferentium (Bullarium Rom. II., 435, A.D. 1746). In July, 1175, at Ferentium, he confirmed the order of St. James in Spain (Labbe & Coss. x 1383). In October, 1175, at Anagnia, the order of St. Basil, at Messina, (Idem 1385). To two other monasteries at Anagnia, in May, 1176, (Bull. Rom. II., 440, 441). In June 1176, Baronius states that he was "residing at Anagnia," where his "consistory" was then held (*annals* xii. 666). Four other charters to monasteries in June and July, 1176, at Anagnia (Bull. Rom. II., 441, 444, 445.) In September, 1176, at Anagnia, he confirmed the order of Carthusians (Labbe & Coss. x 1386). In February, 1177, he set out from Anagnia to Venice, and got back to Anagnia in December,

1177, the whole year being fully accounted for. In all those years no trace is to be found in any Italian historian of Alexander III. having been at Rome. Nor does the Bullarium give a single document issued by Alexander III., from Rome, from the year 1169 to 1178. In 1178, he was recalled to Rome, and the account of his recall given by Baronius, from the acts of Alexander III. in the Vatican library, demonstrate that he was not, and could not have been, at Rome during the preceding years. The cardinal says, "Year 1178; in which year Pope Alexander being recalled by the Romans, betook himself to Rome. But how he was received, the acts of his life thus deliver. In the meantime the whole clergy of the Roman Church, and the people, seeing that the Emperor Frederick was prostrate at the feet of Pope Alexander, but that the evil of schism was extinct through the Divine protection, considering also that they had incurred

most heavy loss, as well in spirituals as temporals, during long times, by the absence of that Pontiff; by common counsel, they bound themselves by oath concerning the restoration of that pontiff to the see of St. Peter. They therefore sent to him to Anagnia seven men of the best citizens of Rome, with letters from the clergy, senate, and people, suppliantly entreating that he would now think fit to return to his own city, and to the people specially entrusted to him, and have the charge of them. But the Pontiff, although their humble and devout change was very pleasing to him and all the fathers, yet recalling to his memory his former recall* by the same clergy and people, from the countries beyond the Alps, who, after a short time, they had heaped injuries and reproaches on him and his brethren, he, with reason, hesitated to trust in their bland promises, and refused to return to that city, which he knew contained many disturbers of peace, without certain and firm security." This answer being brought back to Rome, they resolved "That they would perform fidelity and homage to the lord Pope; that they would freely restore into the hands and power of the pontiff, the Church of St. Peter, and his royalties, which had been seized by them; that they would, moreover, inviolably observe peace and security to the Pope himself, and to his brethren, and to their goods, and to all those coming to him." And then follows the account of his public entry, "all, indeed, grieving at this, that, by their own fault, they had been deprived of so great a good for so long a time."—*Baronii. Annal. 1178.*

From this account of his restoration, it evidently appears that Pope Alexander III. had not been in Rome for a long time; and from the security which he exacted, it appears that it would not previously have been safe for him, or any one coming to him, to have shown their faces in Rome. It further appears that "the Church of St. Peter" had been seized on by his enemies, and, of course, served by the priests of Callistus III., who were under sentence of excommunication by Alexander III. The importance of this fact will appear further on.

If, then, Cornelius, as we are informed by the most authentic historians, did go to Rome, in 1175 or 1176, to confer with the Pope, it was Pope Callistus III. that he went to confer with, and not Pope Alexander III. And, if he conferred with him, he joined in communion with him too.

It is curious that all the accounts which Dr. Dixon gives agree in attributing these words to Cornelius, when he entered the monastery of Lemenc—"I have officiated in St. Peter's, of Armagh; I visited St. Peter's, at Rome; and I come to die in St. Peter's of Lemenc, (P. 70, 80, 90, 108). And the Bishop of St. Maurienne makes it, "I have offered my devotions in the Church of St. Peter of Rome" (p. 70).

Either these accounts are all forged, or "the blessed Cornelius" was a schismatic and a rebel against Pope Alexander III., by joining in schismatrical worship. And, in that case, the fact that Cornelius should have worked miracles, and should immediately be worshipped all through Savoy, and that his worship should continue to this day, may be rather perplexing to Dr. Dixon, and all the rest who now believe that Alexander III. was the true Pope.

It was on this written communication from the Bishop of St. Maurienne that Dr. Dixon acted. He appears to have relied on it implicitly, without even looking to see how many popes there were at that time.

The only ancient or genuine document which Dr. Dixon gives respecting this Concord of Chambery is the letter of Ferrandus to Bollandus, written in 1653, and the hymn to Concord, both of which are in the *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists (*die quarta Junii*). "Among these (the monks of Lemenc), the whole body of St. Concordius, an Irish Archbishop, is religiously preserved and worshipped, of whose life I have not been able to gather or learn anything, except a hymn inscribed in very ancient characters, before the altar, sacred to the holy man, which I insert verbatim, disfigured with foul misspellings, as was the barbarous practice of those times, 'which hymn speaks only of Concors, bishop of Illand.'"

On this, Father Papebroch, observes—"We have never known any such place as 'Yllandia' or 'Illandia.' Ferrarius understanding Ireland, (Irlandia), has announced him to us as an Irish Archbishop. The Fullientes (monks of Lemenc), understanding it Iceland,

* This Bull is not given in the Bullarium, though we find there one of same date, January 28th, 1671, confirming the worship of the blessed Ludovica. Bull. Rom. Coeg. Romæ, 1746, vii. 86.

* This recall took place in 1165. Du Pin. II. 332.

† Salve Procul pretiose, Quondam Pater Illandiae. (p. 106.) Dr. Dixon translates "Pater," "Primate," in order to help out his case.

(*Ilandia*), &c." Papebroch thinks the monks must give up their opinion when they find there is no bishop named Concord in the catalogue of the bishops of Iceland, and that they had no Archbishop in Iceland. "We must therefore," he says, "return to the opinion of Ferrandus interpreting *Ilandia, Ireland*." But here Papebroch honestly confesses that just the same difficulty arises about making Concord an Irishman, as we find no bishop of that name in the Irish catalogue. But, at least it might seem that there is a difficulty less about Ireland, as there were Archbishops there. But to this Papebroch gives a very candid answer, which answer Dr. Dixon leaves out, viz.:—"The dignity of Archbishop is not free from suspicion, being nowhere expressed in the hymn itself, but only affixed to the title of the hymn." In fact, the hymn only calls Concord *bishop, Praesul*; and the word *Archbishop* at the end of the title bears evident marks of having been added by an ignorant person; for the title runs thus—"Prayer of the Confessor Bishop B. Concord, *Archbishop of Yllandia*," which is about as absurd as if any one were to call Dr. Dixon "*Bishop Dixon, Archbishop of Ireland*!" There is, therefore, reason to suppose that the "*Archbishop*" was added by some ignorant person, especially as an *Archbishop* is called by the name of his see, not of his country.

Papebroch goes on to give a remarkable instance how the dignity of *Archbishop* is applied in the *Acta Sanctorum* to another Irishman, who certainly was not an *Archbishop*, in the instance of Silans (*Acta Sanctorum, 21. Maii*) who died in 1004, and is represented as wearing the *Archiepiscopal Pallium*, which as Papebroch justly observes, was never worn in Ireland until 1152. Papebroch therefore concludes, "I have thought it sufficient, therefore, to write *Concord a bishop* in the heading, leaving the further investigation of his age and see to the learned Irish.

It is here clear that the learned Papebroch never dreamed that the Latin names Cornelius and Concord could be the same; but thought, perhaps, that some *Bishop Concord* might yet be found in Ireland, which discovery has never been made.

It remains to inquire, whether the hymn inscribed at Chambery, can possibly apply to Cornelius, *Archbishop of Armagh*. The hymn has no date; it does not mention Cornelius, nor Alexander III.; but it contains this unlucky verse:—

*In Ilandia serviri
Petro Apostolo Sancto,
Rome Petrum Visitari,
Tumulabor in Lemeno.*

*I have served St. Peter in Iland,
I have visited St. Peter at Rome,
I shall be buried in Lemenc.*

If this hymn be fixed to the date of 1175 or 1176, (in which years only it could apply to Cornelius,) then Concord, whoever he was, worshipped in the church of St. Peter at Rome, when that church was served by priests who acknowledged Pope Callistus III., and were actually under sentence of excommunication by Alexander III., and this is all the hymn can prove about Cornelius. In which case, Dr. Dixon's thigh bone can really be fit for nothing now, but to break the head of the Editor of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, if he can be got at.

Now, we ask, where is the proof that Concord of Chambery, and Cornelius of Armagh are the same person? We find that only in the statement of the Bishop of St. Maurienne, and the pamphlet of Count Firnex, *both written in the year 1854*; and also in the life of St. Concord, printed in 1809 (which Dr. Dixon was ashamed to publish), and IN NO OLDER OR MORE CREDIBLE DOCUMENT. Such evidence is really contemptible. Miracles which happened 700 years ago (if they happened at all) cannot be proved by documents written yesterday.

The hymn does not speak of Cornelius, but it does speak of miracles.

*In transitu hujus sancti
Miracula fiant multa;
Aegri sunt sani effecti
Per suu magna merita.*

*At the death of this saint,
Many miracles are wrought—
The sick are healed through his
great merits.*

But the hymn only *specifies* one miracle; and that is one which it will puzzle Dr. Dixon to apply to Cornelius:—

*Deposito presulis
Fuit a Deo relata,
Nam in libriss ab angereis
Per orbem fuit descripta.*

*The death of the prelate
Was published by God: for,
Angels described it in books
All over the world.*

The prayer, which is also given by the Bollandists, and which Dr. Dixon has given in his book (p. 118), makes this miracle still more plain. "O God.... who that thou mightst make the day of his death venerable throughout the whole world, didst cause his name to be inscribed, marvellously, on the same day, by thy holy angels in martyrologies, &c."

Now, if this miracle be true, how came it never to be found in a book in Ireland until now, as Dr. Dixon himself confesses in his introduction, p. x. We have seen too much of miraculous stories of the middle ages to believe in such nonsense as this.

To us, Irishmen as we are, nothing seems more natural than that Cornelius, *Archbishop of Armagh*, should have gone to Rome in 1175 or 1176 to see Pope Callistus III. Nothing more unnatural or more base than that he should have gone to see Pope Alexander III. Cornelius was an Irishman, and an Irish churchman. Pope Alexander III., was at that time the deadly enemy of Irish independence. Only three years before, he had sold Ireland

to Henry II. and the English, and had foully calumniated the Irish church, to cloak his own wickedness. What more natural, than that an Irish Archbishop, zealous for the liberty of his country and the honour of his church, should go to Rome, (as all Irish historians say Cornelius did in 1175,) to Pope Callistus III., who was then in actual possession of the see of Rome, to try if he could find in him any decency or virtue, or honour, becoming his station? Yet, Dr. Dixon is not ashamed to say that it was to Pope ALEXANDER III., the great betrayer of Irish nationality, the great calumniator of the Irish church, that Cornelius went. And, it is simply on the very ground that Cornelius went to this arch enemy of Ireland, that Dr. Dixon calls on Irish Roman Catholics to fall down and worship Cornelius. But, we have shown that the wretched life of Concord, published only forty-four years ago, and which Dr. Dixon was himself ashamed to reprint, is the only document that ever said that Cornelius went to Pope ALEXANDER III. And the story is proved by the plainest facts of the history of that age to be a contemptible forgery. But, on this contemptible forgery Irish Roman Catholics are now to be called on to sacrifice every feeling sacred to the history of their country, before the shrine of Roman ambition.

Our readers may remember what we said in our number for Dec. 1853, p. 137, on the wholesale manufacturing of forged epistles of Popes of the early ages, to support the supremacy of Rome. We then showed to what an extent Roman doctrines are actually founded on such forgeries. We may yet have space, as we have abundant material, to make this exposure more full.

Rome boasts of being unchanged and unchangeable. What wonder, then, that the manufacturing of forgeries is still in operation to sustain the impostures of Rome. All this may be not without an aim. Rome has ever been hostile to nationality. Not that Rome avows this. It would defeat the object. She usually professes to cherish, and she flatters nationality, that she may get it into her embrace; but the secret managers of the policy of Rome have always looked steadily to the extinction of national feeling. For Rome demands for herself what patriotism gives to one's country. In the twelfth century she destroyed the nationality of Ireland, to bring Peter's Pence to Rome. True to the same principles, she seeks now to humble Irish nationality before the dead bones of its betrayers. What greater triumph could Roman policy now have in Ireland, than to see Irishmen bow down before the bones of Cornelius, on the ground of his alleged submission to the Bull of Pope Alexander III.?

It is not without a deep design that the era of 1176 was fixed upon for the selection of a thigh-bone to be worshipped. That era determined Cornelius as the man. And though this involved a contradiction between the document which had to be framed, and the awkward fact of two Popes at the one time (the wrong one being in the right place) yet this seemed not insurmountable—perhaps even desirable. For what if homage to Alexander III. must be based on a transparent forgery? Yet it might succeed, as so many similar attempts have succeeded. And if successful, the greater is the exaltation of Rome, in triumphing at once over the nationality, the intellect, and the moral sense of her victims. Choose this solution, or one less flattering to the wisdom of the forgers—that they are profoundly ignorant of the most notorious facts in the history of the Papacy itself. A clearer case of forgery never was convicted. Yet, on this convicted forgery, a grand religious display will, no doubt, be celebrated, notwithstanding. We would have healed our countrymen, and they are not healed. We must look longer yet on the spectacle of forgery and fraud in the deceivers, and credulity and degradation in the deceived. This is the spectacle afforded by a church that prohibits free discussion. Yet it will not be lost on those that have the courage to think. In the depth of the degradation into which men are driven, lies the last hope of their deliverance.

RELIGIOUS PROCESSIONS.

READER, did you ever hear of angels on horseback? Perhaps you have seen one. If not, read the following description, transcribed verbatim from page 25 of the "*Legends of the Blessed Virgin*," published in London in 1852, by Charles Dolman, and you will be able to judge how much edification or amusement we lose by the law which, in these countries, prohibits the enactment of religious processions:—

"Malines, or Mechlin, is perhaps the only city in the world which has preserved in all their original perfection the religious *fêtes* or shows of the middle ages. In 1825, at the Jubilee of St. Rombould, to whom it is indebted for the knowledge of the Gospel, and in 1838, at the Jubilee of our Lady of Hanswyck (the name of a venerated image held in great esteem), this old Christian city exhibited the magnificent and popular spectacle of those gigantic processions, rich in allegory, and studded with those attractive costumes which delight the crowd, whose appearance reminds one of the times of Philip the Good, when the same *fêtes* took place exactly in the same manner, the spectators alone differing."

"We will here faithfully describe in all its details the grand procession of 1838, in the persuasion that they

will be appreciated by our readers, few of whom, perhaps, have ever assisted at any *fête* of so remarkable a

"First marched a band of music on foot, in the costume of the present day, after which rode a squadron of cavalry. This formed as it were a modern preface to an ancient work. The following was the order of the procession:—

"A group of sixteen angels on horseback, with large extended wings and azure bodies, sounding golden trumpets around the herald who carried the standard of the Jubilee. They announced the coming of the representation of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin of Loretto.

"This sweet and favourite devotion of the people was represented by emblematical figures. First came thirty-six maidens, mounted on horses, elegantly dressed in white, in the modest and becoming fashion of Christian art, wearing crowns on their heads, from which fell rich lace veils. Each one carried in her left hand the attribute she represented—the *Tower of David*, the *House of Gold*, the *Tower of Ivory*, the *Mystical Rose*, the *Mirror of Justice*, &c.; and from their right hands waved banners of white silk. On every banner was worked, in letters of gold, some title given to our blessed Lady—as, *Amiable Mother*, *Admirable Mother*, *Powerful Virgin*, *Clement Virgin*, *Cause of our Joy*, *Health of the Sick*, *Refuge of Sinners*, *Consolatrix of the Afflicted*, and *Help of Christians* &c. Thus the show was for the people a continual prayer.

"The concluding portion of the Litany, in which the dignity of Queen is so justly attributed to Mary, called forth still more majestic representation. Eight triumphal chariots bore the groups emblematic of these glorious titles of our heavenly queen.

"Before the cars rode choirs of angels, with snow-white wings and starry foreheads, playing on harps and psalteries, mounted on palfreys magnificently caparisoned. The *Queen of Angels* was in the first car, drawn by six cream-coloured horses. She was raised on a golden throne, around which knelt many heavenly spirits. Seraphim, cherubim, archangels, and angels, surrounded their Queen; the powers, principalities, and dominions carried crowns and sceptres. All these characters were borne by young girls, taken from the noblest families of Malines.

"The *Queen of Patriarchs* was in the second car, attended by the venerable personages of the old law—Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, &c.

"Next came the *Queen of Prophets*, round whose throne might be seen the inspired men, whose voices recorded the future as plainly as the past from Abraham to St. John the Baptist.

"The fourth car bore the *Queen of Apostles*, who sat on a high throne, covered by a canopy, over which was raised the arms of the See of Peter, the eternal emblem of the Church. Among the twelve Apostles, the chosen ones of Christ, who were directly commissioned by him to propagate his holy gospel, might be seen their successors, who had been chiefly instrumental in spreading the Christian religion in the north of Gaul—St. Roinbauld, St. Servais, St. Amand, St. Lambert, St. Lievin, St. Gomer, and St. Willibrod.

"The *Queen of Martyrs* sat in the fifth chariot, which represented the whole of the earth; for where has not the blood of Christians been shed for the faith? Princesses and recluses, bishops and soldiers, children and old men, young girls and mothers—all were there bearing their palms of triumph.

"The sixth car was formed like a pulpit, and carried the *Queen of Confessors* and her militant court; the young girl who held the reins bore also a naked sword, to show that they who laboured in the propagation of the faith must always be ready to shed their blood, if necessary, in its defence.

"Next came the *Queen of Virgins*. The fair charioteer of this car trod the pleasures of the world under her feet; behind her was a wheel and a palm, and on her right a lamb, emblem of innocence.

"The eighth chariot was made to represent the heavens, in which reigned the *Queen of all Saints*, surrounded by her heavenly court, round whom shone a brilliant glory. The Grand Harmonic Society of Malines followed the Litany; but it sadly marred the effect of the whole to see the members dressed in the modern costume. Better had it been to give them the characters of the court of David, or some others corresponding with the allegorical nature of the festival. But see, here is *Malines* herself, represented by a beautiful child crowned with towers, and surrounded by nine maidens, bearing emblems of the virtues of the city—*faith, prudence, charity, union, constancy, fidelity, valour, modesty, and justice*.

"The cavalry officers, the king's aides-de-camp, and the grand officers of the court, followed on horseback. Behind them is a royal car drawn by eight horses, in which are faithfully represented, by children of twelve years of age, the king and queen of the Belgians upon their throne. The attributes of the arts, commerce, justice, and war, group at their feet. The car is led by fidelity, religion, justice, goodness; Belgium, wisdom, and generosity are the attendants of their majesties.